

and with its buttresses, turrets, and richly ornamented panelling, is unrivalled. Two of the statues, which formerly filled niches in the lower part of the tower, remain, and these seem not to have been made for their position. One is a bearded male figure; the other a female figure, crowned, holding something in each hand.

The portion of the spire which remains is 26 feet 4 inches in diameter at the bottom, and 36 feet high. The masonry composing it is 2 feet 3 inches thick at bottom, and tapers in the height of 19 feet to 8½ inches, of which thickness it continues to the top.

Bottoner, after describing the spire, says, "*quidem spera stat modo ultra 100 pedes*,"—"stands at the present time (1490) above 100 feet." Dallaway, in his edition of "The Kinerary," says—"Are we to conclude that the spire, after having been struck by lightning, was still 100 feet high?" and suggests, that, as it has not such an elevation now, it had been written "*stetit modo*—stood once, or not long since."

I am disposed to think, however, that Bottoner meant to give the height it then was, and that this height was greater than it is now, and was very probably the 100 feet he speaks of. For, in another place, he says, the width of the parapet, or *Le Garland*, as he calls it, round the top of the broken spire, is 11 feet. Whereas the present diameter of the top of the spire is about 20 feet; and, moreover, if the lines of the spire be carried out to the height of 100 feet, the width there will be found to be about 11 feet.

[An account of the labours of the committee, and the progress of the restoration, which followed here, together with the verbal description of the church, we are compelled to omit.]

The present deplorable condition of the building must distress every lover of our ancient architecture. Externally it is a crumbling ruin; the parapets falling, the walls splitting, and the spires on the tower so disrupted and decaying as to threaten at no distant period some serious catastrophe. On the question of "restoration" generally, none would oppose more earnestly than I would, the destruction of an ancient edifice, with all its associations and time tints, to substitute for it a new copy, however well executed, so long as it could be maintained fit for its purpose. And, indeed, in the case of a sepulchral monument, from which nothing is required but as a record, so long as one stone could be kept on another, so long would I retain the original memorial, a thousand times more interesting and suggestive than any imitation of it could possibly be. Most earnestly, therefore, should it be impressed on all authorities who have charge of our architectural glories and sepulchral memorials of departed great, to obtain for them such early and constant attention that they may be long preserved in their original condition. The "stitch in time" of the homely proverb applies as forcibly to a structure as to a stocking.

In the case of St. Mary's, Redcliffe, however, no question of this sort arises. If it be not renewed its character must utterly pass away. There is but little of the exterior of the church that can possibly be maintained; and if we would preserve the structure for its sacred purpose, and transmit to posterity the noble specimen of skill and piety which our forefathers gave to us in *trust*, there is no other course than restoration—conducted with a pains-taking and anxious desire to make the building what it originally was.

Chatterton, Dallaway, and others, spoke of the restoration of the north porch as a thing not likely to be attempted; yet we now see that by the unlooked-for interference of an earnest individual studiously concealing himself from praise,—one acting up to the opinion that

"Who builds a church to God and not to Fame
Will never mark the marble with his name,"—

this is now being done.

Pride of country, love of beauty, and duty to God, all prompt so strongly to the completion

of the restoration, that I have no doubt whatever as to the result. GEORGE GODWIN.

ON CLEOPATRA'S NEEDLE AT ALEXANDRIA.

The Mode adopted by the ancient Egyptians in the removal of large Masses,—also by the French, of the Column of Luxor; and a Proposal to bring to England the Column called Cleopatra's Needle.

ALEXANDER founded Alexandria 333 years B.C., consequently 2184 years since.

The Pharos was less than a mile from the shore, joined to the mainland by a causeway: upon the causeway stands the modern city; population near 25,000. After the French occupation, it is said to have been reduced to 7,000, from the above 25,000.

The ancient city was on the main land to the eastward, and as it now stands, it appears to have been built and rebuilt over and over again, on more ancient ruins; the whole soil, in fact, being "debris."

The two granite obelisks, called "Cleopatra's Needles," still remain; one standing, the other lying beside it, nearly buried in sand. They were cut from the red granite of Syene, 1,200 miles higher up the Nile, at the first cataracts; and were originally erected at Heliopolis, and brought to Alexandria by one of the Cæsars. From certain authorities, it would appear that both were standing at the close of the 12th century: the fallen one is said to have a corner broken, and its face not so perfect as that at Luxor. Their present position is at the bottom of the bay of the new port, just inside the old wall, at the Roman Tower, and close to the beach. It was here that Mahomet Ali offered to build a pier for the embarkation of the prostrate obelisk, and to render every assistance to Captain Smyth, R.N., in 1822, towards its removal.

The water of the port deepens sufficiently quick for the floating of a flat-built vessel with such a cargo: the tide (influenced principally by the wind) does not rise more than from 7 to 14 inches. The elevation of ground may be from 12 to 20 feet above the level of the sea.

These obelisks are of 65 feet shaft, and between 7 and 8 feet square at the large end, each side covered with hieroglyphics.

Captain Smyth, R.N., says one is 63 feet 5 inches by 7 feet 3 inches at the base, and 5 feet at the apex. This corresponds very nearly with the Column of Luxor, now at Paris, and the Column at Constantinople, and with others at Rome. Of the removal of that at Constantinople, I do not remember to have seen any account, either of the time, or the means used in its transport. We have short notices of the removal of some of those at Rome by different emperors.

In 1801, a proposition was made by the British officers then in Egypt to remove the fallen pillar to this country; but their proceedings were stopped by the order of Lord Keith when the preparations gave anticipations of prosperous results; and on the 15th April, 1832, a similar proposition was made in the House of Commons. It was then stated that the stone weighed 284 tons, and would cost 15,000*l.* for its transport.

Captain Smyth supposed it to be 230 tons; and, in 1822, he was prepared with the consent of Mahomet Ali to have attempted its removal; but could not procure the authority of our Government, and so it remains on the sand.

On the mode of moving great masses of stone, anciently adopted in Egypt:—

It is said that there formerly stood at Saïs, in the Delta, a temple formed of a single block of granite, which had been floated down the Nile on a raft from the quarry in Elephantine.

Two thousand men are said to have been engaged for three years in the removal of this temple—being more than 30 feet in length, 20 feet in breadth, and 12 feet in height, and, on an average, 5 feet in thickness.

* The writer of the following memoir urges, with justice, that the feeling manifested with respect to the Great Exhibition above, that the public would now appreciate the erection in London of the ancient obelisk belonging to them, and that the pecuniary success of the Exhibition offers the means of indulging the public taste, without calling on the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

The stone quarries of Egypt and Nubia show at this time, distinctly, the mode in which the stones were cut and prepared for removal.

At the present time, there is a cubical block lying in the road between the granite quarries and Syene, which from some cause has been stopped in transit.

In one of the quarries of "El'Masara," the mode of transporting the stone is represented: it was drawn on a sledge by oxen to an inclined plane leading to the river.

It may be supposed that these large masses were transported in the rough to the spots where they were intended to be raised, and there cut into shape, engraved, and polished.

The obelisks, when cut, may be supposed to have been raised on to sledges and drawn to the river, then placed on a raft by a pier projecting to a certain distance over the raft, to let the weight down on to a proper bearing position.

More ponderous blocks, too, have been drawn by immense masses of men.

Between Antinoë and El'Bersneh, Captains Irby and Mangles discovered the representation of a colossus dragged by men with ropes—172 men in four rows of 43 each: the number may, however, be indefinite. Grease or oil, or some other material, was poured from a vase, as is done in Amsterdam at the present time, by a bag of grease thrown under the sleighs used for removing merchandise, or wheelless carriages.

The height of this statue appears to have been about 24 feet, formed from limestone—and bound to the sledge by double ropes—tightened by pegs twisted round—much as crooked timber is now fastened on trucks and braced.

Pliny describes a mode of transporting obelisks by lashing two flat-bottomed boats together side by side, and then admitting them into a trench or canal, cut from the Nile to where the stone lay; the boats being loaded with ballast, equal in weight to the object to be removed; which, so soon as the boats had been introduced beneath the block, was taken out, and the boats rising as they were lightened, floated away the obelisk, instead of the ballast.

At Constantinople is an obelisk similar to that from Luxor, now at Paris; though of the time and mode of its transportation we know nothing. It is 75 feet high, on a pedestal 12 feet, in all 90 feet; 7 feet wide at the bottom, and 5 feet at the apex; said to have been erected by Theodosius, though not imported by him. Constantine brought the finest from Heliopolis to adorn his new capital, but got no further than Alexandria: his son Constantine had it conveyed to Rome: it is that now standing before St. Jean de Lateran, thrown down and broken by the barbarians, but mended and repaired by Fontana. There are other notices of this having been brought from Thebes to Alexandria by Constantine, and from Alexandria to Rome by his son Constantine—another, the first brought, was by Augustus. Pliny's mode was probably adopted in the removal and transport of them all; of which twelve still remain; as well as some in the four other cities of Italy: they were transported in enormous galleys, but of the mode by which they were taken down and embarked, we are not informed, so far as least as I know. Nor were Italy and Constantinople the only places embellished by Egyptian obelisks, during the age of the Cæsars. Arles, in the south of France, had been so embellished though by whom brought, and at what period is not ascertained: however, we know that this city was held in high favour by Julius Cæsar, and that he commenced an amphitheatre, the ruins of which remain.

The account from which this is taken gives the size of this Arles obelisk as 36 feet French in height, 7 feet wide at base. In Brewster's Encyclopedia it is given as 58 feet high, 7 feet wide.

Arles was the most magnificent city in Gaul at the time of the Cæsars, and was celebrated for commerce and ship building, and for the assistance it gave Cæsar in his Gallic wars and his invasion of England.

* Bristol Mirror office, 1851.

† *Littérature de la Garlande* contient 26. pages.